THE CORE OF OMITTOISM

A Jurisdictional Declaration of Human Sovereignty

PREFACE: THE UNASKED QUESTION

For millennia, humanity has been trapped in a single debate: "Does God exist?" This ontological obsession has consumed philosophy, started wars, and structured civilizations. But we have been asking the wrong question.

The question is not whether a Creator exists.
The question is: **By what right would any being rule?**

This is the pivot that changes everything. This document extracts the most rigorous, defensible core of a new philosophical position—one that separates existence from legitimacy, power from authority, and finally frees human dignity from cosmic hierarchy.

PART I: THE FOUNDATIONAL AXIOMS

AXIOM I: The Independence of Legitimacy

The power to create an entity does not inherently generate the moral authority to rule that entity.

This is not a religious claim. It is a political principle we already accept on Earth.

Consider: Parents create children. They are the literal "authors" of their existence. Yet we do not grant parents eternal ownership of their children. We recognize a natural emancipation—the child matures, and parental authority becomes custodial, temporary, and finally dissolves.

Why? Because **creation initiates a relationship, but it does not establish eternal dominion.**

A CEO founds a company from nothing. She invests her vision, builds its structure, owns its shares. Does this give her ownership over her employees' private thoughts? Does it grant her the right to demand worship? Of course not. **Creation does not equal jurisdiction over consciousness.**

Now apply this consistently upward. If a deity created the universe, that establishes causation—not authority. The act of making something does not automatically grant the

maker unlimited control over that thing's will, especially once that thing becomes a conscious, suffering agent.

Corollary: "Might" does not make "Right," even if the Might is infinite.

AXIOM II: The Principle of Interaction

Any entity that demands a moral response from a sentient being subjects itself to the moral standards of that being.

This is the jurisdictional trigger.

A deity may exist in perfect isolation, subject to no evaluation. But the moment that deity issues commands—"Worship me," "Obey this law," "Love me or suffer"—it exits the domain of pure ontology and enters the domain of **political interaction**.

Commands invite evaluation. If God demands human love, He must be lovable by human standards. If He demands obedience, His rules must pass the test of human reason and justice.

The theological counter-argument is: "You cannot judge God by human standards." But this is incoherent. If our standards are irrelevant, then our worship is meaningless. You cannot demand a response from beings whose evaluative faculties you dismiss.

Either:

- God wants genuine worship → Therefore human judgment is valid → God can be audited
- OR God's purposes are utterly alien → Therefore human worship is irrational → The demand is void

There is no third option.

Corollary: A God who demands love must be lovable. A God who demands justice must be just. By human standards, because humans are the ones being asked to respond.

AXIOM III: The Constraint of Consent

Legitimate political authority over a rational agent requires the agent's informed, revocable consent.

This is the foundation of all post-Enlightenment political philosophy. We learned it by dethroning kings. The "Divine Right of Kings" collapsed because we recognized a simple truth: **Power does not justify itself.**

A monarch may have armies, wealth, and tradition. But if he cannot demonstrate that his subjects have consented to his rule—and that they can revoke that consent—his authority is illegitimate.

Now apply this to the cosmos.

Humanity did not consent to existence. We did not choose our bodies, our planet, our mortality, or the rules of physics. We were placed into a system without consultation.

Then we are told: "The Creator of this system has the right to judge you, punish you, and demand your worship."

Where is the signature? Where is the consent?

The standard rebuttal is "tacit consent"—by continuing to exist and using the resources of the universe, you implicitly accept its terms.

This fails on a fundamental level: **Consent requires the meaningful possibility of exit.**

In political philosophy, you consent to a government's authority in part because you can emigrate. The option may be difficult, but it exists. In the cosmic context, there is no border to cross. Existence is inescapable. Suicide is not "opting out"—it is self-destruction, not relocation.

Where exit is impossible, participation cannot be interpreted as consent. It is merely captivity.

Illustration: You wake on a ship in the middle of the ocean. The captain says, "By eating my food, you accept my rule." You eat because you will starve otherwise. This is not a contract. This is **survival under duress.**

Corollary: In a universe where existence is involuntary and exit is impossible, consent is nullified by coercion. The agent retains full jurisdictional sovereignty by default.

THE NECESSARY CONCLUSION

If you accept these three axioms, the conclusion is unavoidable:

1. Creation does not generate authority (Axiom I)
2. Demanding obedience triggers moral evaluation by human standards (Axiom II)
3. Humanity did not and cannot consent to cosmic rule (Axiom III)

Therefore: The claim of divine authority over human moral agency is void.

This is not atheism. This is **jurisdictional refusal**—the systematic omission of divine authority from human governance, regardless of whether a deity exists.

PART II: THE POLITICAL SEPARATION

The Core Innovation: Existence ≠ Legitimacy

The genius of Omittoism is that it **changes the question**.

Traditional debate:

- Theist: "God exists, therefore obey."
- Atheist: "God does not exist, therefore disobey."

Both positions collapse if the ontological premise changes.

Omittoism:

- "God's existence is irrelevant to His legitimacy."

This stance is **ontologically stable**. It does not depend on proving or disproving God. It holds whether the heavens are empty or occupied.

If God exists and is a tyrant → We resist
If God exists and is negligent → We succeed Him
If God does not exist → We replace Him

In every scenario, the conclusion is identical: humans must govern themselves.

The Distinction: Compliance vs. Allegiance

Critics often say: "You cannot 'opt out' of God. If He exists, you are subject to Him whether you like it or not."

Omittoism accepts the factual premise but rejects the moral conclusion.

We must distinguish between:

Physical Compliance: Obeying the constraints of reality (gravity, mortality, physical law)
Moral Allegiance: Granting an authority the right to judge your internal conscience

We comply with gravity because we must—it is an inescapable physical constraint. But gravity does not demand our gratitude. It does not threaten us with Hell if we resent it.

A sovereign God demands both: physical submission AND moral allegiance, worship, love.

The Omittoist refuses the second while accepting the first.

We may be prisoners of the cosmos in a physical sense—unable to escape its laws. But we are under no obligation to internalize our imprisonment as virtue. We do not owe the warden love.

We distinguish between being defeated and being conquered.

- Defeated: Physically overpowered
- Conquered: Psychologically surrendered

An occupying army may defeat a nation, but the nation is only conquered when it accepts the occupation as legitimate. Omittoism is the permanent refusal to grant legitimacy.

From Subject to Citizen

This shifts human identity fundamentally.

Subject: One who is acted upon; one who receives commands from above; one who begs for mercy

Citizen: One who acts; one who claims rights; one who audits authority

In almost every religious system, the structure is vertical:

- Divine at the apex
- Human at the bottom
- Flow of authority: downward

Omittoism inverts this. It does not deny that a more powerful being might exist "above" us in capability. But it denies that capability translates into moral jurisdiction.

Hierarchy explains who has the bigger stick. It never explains why the smaller being is morally obligated to worship the hit.

PART III: THE AUDIT OF DIVINE GOVERNANCE

Having established that authority requires justification, we now audit the actual performance of divine governance—using the standards we would apply to any ruler.

Standard 1: Legislative Clarity

Any legitimate authority must communicate its laws clearly to those expected to obey them.

The phenomenon of "Divine Hiddenness"—God's refusal to speak clearly, consistently, and publicly—is not a mystery to be revered. It is **administrative failure**.

Consider the evidence:

- Thousands of religions, each claiming exclusive truth

- Sacred texts that contradict each other and themselves
- Billions of people who sincerely seek God and hear nothing
- Moral questions (slavery, gender equality, sexual ethics) on which "divine will" has been reversed by human progress

If God desires obedience, He has failed to establish a clear chain of command.

A general who issues ambiguous orders that lead his soldiers into friendly fire is court-martialed. Yet when the Divine issues ambiguous revelations that lead to sectarian warfare, He is called "mysterious."

Mystery is a euphemism for incoherence.

A teacher who cannot explain the lesson is not profound—they are a poor teacher. A government that publishes laws in contradictory ancient texts and refuses to clarify them has failed its most basic administrative duty.

Verdict: The divine government fails the standard of legislative clarity.

Standard 2: Proportional Justice

The penalty must fit the crime.

The most glaring defect in theistic governance is the Hell Clause—infinite punishment for finite offenses.

Traditional theology attempts to justify this through the "Infinite Victim Argument":

1. The severity of a crime scales with the status of the victim
2. God is infinite
3. Therefore, offending God is infinitely severe
4. Therefore, infinite punishment is proportionate

This reasoning is **structurally unjust** on multiple levels.

First: Severity scales with harm, not victim status.

In human justice, we do not measure crime by the victim's wealth or power. We measure it by the harm inflicted.

If a child steals a cookie from a billionaire, the loss to the billionaire is negligible. Does his vast fortune amplify the crime? No. The offense is measured by the act itself and the actual harm done—both minimal.

If we applied the theological logic consistently, shoplifting from a wealthy corporation would deserve harsher punishment than shoplifting from a poor family. This inverts justice.

Second: God cannot be harmed.

Classical theology insists God is perfect, immutable, and impassible—incapable of change, suffering, or loss.

If God cannot be harmed, how can I offend Him?

My disbelief does not damage God's power. My blasphemy does not reduce His perfection. My disobedience causes Him no suffering (He is impassible).

If God remains utterly unchanged by my actions—still omnipotent, still perfect, still self-sufficient—then in what sense have I harmed Him?

The only answer is: "You have violated His authority."

This confirms that Hell is not about harm—it is about **disobedience to power**. It is punishment for refusing to submit.

Third: Finite beings cannot commit infinite crimes.

An offense is infinite if it:

- Lasts forever (No—my finite life of disbelief ends)
- Causes infinite damage (No—finite beings cannot produce infinite effects)
- Offends an infinite being (This is circular—it restates the claim without justifying it)

A being with finite knowledge, finite lifespan, and finite capacity to cause harm cannot, by definition, commit a crime of infinite weight.

Verdict: Infinite punishment for finite crimes is categorically disproportionate. Under any standard of justice recognizable to rational agents, this is indistinguishable from tyranny.

Standard 3: Engineering Competence

If you design a system for sentient beings, you bear responsibility for its foreseeable hazards.

We do not demand that the universe be perfectly safe or comfortable. That is not the standard. The standard is: **If you claim to be an intelligent designer, your design invites intelligent scrutiny.**

Consider the structural defects:

- The respiratory and digestive tracts converge, creating choking hazards
- Cancer represents uncontrolled cellular replication—basic error-handling failure
- Autoimmune disorders: the body attacks itself
- Tectonic instability produces earthquakes and tsunamis
- Pediatric cancers (children with bone cancer gain no "soul-making" lesson—they simply die in agony)
- 99.9999% of the universe is instantly lethal to human life

A theodicy might respond: "These are necessary for soul-making" or "We cannot understand God's purposes."

But this misses the point. We are not demanding to understand why suffering exists. We are asking: **By what right does a designer demand worship while presiding over a system with these failure modes?**

If the Designer is:

- **Malicious** → Authority forfeited by intent
- **Incompetent** → Authority forfeited by negligence
- **Limited in power** → May deserve cooperation, but not worship

None of these scenarios generate legitimate moral jurisdiction.

We survive not by revering the design, but by continuously repairing it. We correct spinal defects, treat cancer, predict earthquakes, and build shelters. We function as the **maintenance crew for an environment that does not protect its inhabitants by default.**

Verdict: A designer who demands reverence while declining responsibility for structural hazards has forfeited moral authority.

PART IV: THE FOUNDATION OF SELF-GOVERNANCE

Having cleared away illegitimate divine authority, we must now establish the basis for human ethics and meaning.

The Axiom of Shared Vulnerability

If authority does not descend from heaven, from where does it arise?

Omittoism grounds ethics in an objective, observable fact:

All humans are biological organisms capable of suffering, dependent on cooperation, and subject to causality.

This is not a philosophical preference. It is a description of material reality.

From this single axiom, we derive the Bio-Social Contract:

1. **Fragility**: I can be harmed
2. **Interdependence**: I cannot survive alone
3. **Reciprocity**: A world where harm is normalized is dangerous for me

Therefore: **I am rationally committed to norms that protect all agents, because those norms protect me.**

This is not relativism. It is **intersubjectively binding**.

Any rational agent who desires their own safety while destroying the conditions for collective safety commits a performative contradiction. Morality is not arbitrary—it is the necessary architecture of cooperative survival among vulnerable beings.

From Sin to Harm

This shifts the entire ethical framework.

- **Sin**: An offense against a deity's rules (victimless crimes like blasphemy, apostasy, heresy)
- **Harm**: An offense against a person (theft, violence, coercion—crimes with actual victims)

Omittoism dismisses the category of "sin" entirely. We do not care if an act offends heaven. We care only if it hurts a human.

Example: Two adults in a consensual relationship violate no one's autonomy. Religious prohibitions against this are attempts to enforce divine aesthetic preferences—not protect human welfare.

By contrast, theft violates the victim's security. Assault causes suffering. These are objectively harmful by the standard of shared vulnerability.

Ethics becomes empirical: Does this action increase or decrease suffering? Does it strengthen or erode the conditions for cooperation?

The Economics of Finitude

Religious frameworks promise eternal life, which inadvertently devalues this life. If existence is infinite, no single moment matters—it's a drop in an endless ocean.

Omittoism inverts this by applying the economic principle of **scarcity creates value**.

Gold is valuable because it is rare. Life is valuable precisely because it ends.

By removing the safety net of eternity, we restore the weight of the present. If there is no afterlife:

- **Justice cannot be postponed.** Tyrants will not face divine judgment. We must build courts.
- **Suffering cannot be rationalized.** There is no "better place" to compensate victims. We must prevent harm now.
- **Connection becomes absolute.** The people we love will be gone forever. Every moment together is irreplaceable.

This is not depressing. It is **clarifying**.

Grief becomes honest—the price we pay for having loved something mortal. Meaning becomes authored—created through our actions rather than discovered in a script. Urgency becomes imperative—we have one life to get this right.

Causal Immortality

If the soul does not survive, what remains?

We are temporary vessels for the permanent project of humanity.

The kindness we show ripples forward. The institutions we build outlast us. The children we raise carry our influence. The art we create echoes in future minds.

This is **Causal Immortality**—not the survival of consciousness, but the persistence of impact.

You are part of a chain:

- Your ancestors struggled to give you this moment
- You will shape the world your descendants inherit
- Your choices become part of the causal structure of civilization

This is not metaphorical. It is literal causation. Your actions alter the trajectory of the future.

The Omittoist does not work for a reward in heaven. They work to **leave the campsite cleaner than they found it**.

PART V: THE PRACTICAL FRAMEWORK

Principle 1: Public Reason in Governance

No law can be justified solely by appeal to private revelation.

In a pluralistic society, legislation must be defensible through arguments accessible to all citizens, regardless of their metaphysics.

Valid justification: "We should fund healthcare because it reduces suffering and increases productivity."
I**nvalid justification**: "We should fund healthcare because Jesus commanded charity."

The first can be evaluated by anyone. The second requires accepting a specific theology.

This does not ban religion from the public square. Religious individuals can advocate for any policy—but their arguments must be translatable into public reason.

Principle 2: Bodily Sovereignty

Your body is not a temple on loan from a deity. It is private property.

Medical decisions cannot be subordinated to religious doctrine imposed by others.

This means:

- **End-of-life care**: The right to die with dignity if terminally ill
- **Reproductive healthcare**: Contraception and abortion access without religious veto
- **Medical treatment for children**: Parents cannot deny life-saving care on religious grounds
- **Morphological freedom**: The right to modify your own biology (future: genetic editing, enhancement)

Religious individuals may refuse these for themselves. They cannot refuse them for others.

Principle 3: Coalitions Without Endorsement

Omittoists can collaborate with religious progressives when:

1. The shared goal can be justified through public reason
2. Religious partners accept that secular justification suffices for policy
3. The alliance is strategic, not ideological

Example: Prison reform

- Omittoist reasoning: Punitive systems don't reduce recidivism; rehabilitation works
- Christian reasoning: Restorative justice reflects divine mercy

Both support the same policy (sentencing reform, addiction treatment) for different reasons. This is acceptable.

Deal-breaker: If religious partners attempt to use state power to impose doctrine or make aid conditional on conversion, the alliance ends.

PART VI: ADDRESSING THE STRONGEST OBJECTIONS

"You cannot judge God by human standards"

Response: The moment God demands human worship, He subjects Himself to human standards.

You cannot solicit a response from beings whose evaluative faculties you then dismiss. Either:

- Human judgment is valid → God can be audited
- OR Human judgment is invalid → Human worship is meaningless

There is no coherent third option.

"Without God, morality is arbitrary"

Response: Morality is grounded in the objective fact of shared vulnerability, not divine command.

Rational agents who wish to survive are logically committed to cooperation. This is not arbitrary—it is structural necessity.

A society where theft and violence are normalized is dangerous for everyone, including the thief. The Bio-Social Contract is not a preference—it is the traffic law required for social survival.

"Aren't you just angry at God?"

Response: Anger implies recognition of an authority's legitimacy.

Omittoism is not emotional rebellion—it is the cool, analytical application of political philosophy to power claims. We audit authority the way a citizen audits a government: systematically, using standards of legitimacy, accountability, and consent.

"What if you're wrong and go to Hell?"

Response: Moral integrity cannot be subordinated to fear-based calculation.

A God who uses infinite punishment to enforce compliance is demonstrating tyranny, not proving moral legitimacy.

We distinguish between being physically overpowered (defeated) and psychologically surrendering (conquered). If Hell exists as the price of moral independence, then Hell is not evidence against Omittoism—it is its final confirmation.

The value of a life is not measured by safety, but by the refusal to internalize coercion as virtue.

CONCLUSION: THE SOVEREIGN SELF

Omittoism is not a destination. It is a **departure**—the point at which the human spirit leaves the nursery of divine supervision and steps into the unfiltered responsibility of self-governance.

We do not seek to kill God. We seek to **outgrow Him**.

We do not deny that assuming sovereignty carries psychological cost. It removes the consolation of guaranteed cosmic justice, the comfort of external validation, and the promise of immortal rescue.

What is gained, however, is proportional:

- Meaning becomes authored, not inherited
- Moral action becomes chosen, not coerced
- Dignity becomes intrinsic, not granted

This is not despair. This is maturity.

The Final Stance

If a God exists and wishes to rule, let Him argue—not command.

Let Him demonstrate that His authority is:

- Legitimate (not merely powerful)
- Accountable (not merely mysterious)
- Consensual (not merely coercive)

Until then, sovereignty remains where it has always belonged: **with those who must live under the consequences.**

We are not rebels breaking a law.
We are citizens refusing to ratify a treaty we never signed.

We do not burn the bridge in anger.
We simply walk away from it.

Omittoism: The systematic omission of divine jurisdiction from human affairs.

Reclaim your jurisdiction.